arXiv:math/0003020v1 [math.FA] 3 Mar 2000

ORLICZ-PETTIS POLYNOMIALS ON BANACH SPACES

MANUEL GONZÁLEZ AND JOAQUÍN M. GUTIÉRREZ

Abstract. We introduce the class of Orlicz-Pettis polynomials between Banach spaces, defined by their action on weakly unconditionally Cauchy series. We give a number of equivalent definitions, examples and counterexamples which highlight the differences between these polynomials and the corresponding linear operators.

1. Introduction

In the study of the isomorphic properties of Banach spaces, some classes of (bounded linear) operators have been introduced which include the isomorphisms and preserve certain properties of the spaces. These are the *semigroups of operators,* such as the semi-Fredholm operators, associated to the ideal of compact operators [9, 10], the tauberian operators, associated to the weakly compact operators [13, 11], the *Orlicz-Pettis operators,* related to the unconditionally converging operators [8], etc. The semigroups and the operator ideals are somehow opposite notions: for every Banach space X, the identity map I_X belongs to all the semigroups, while the null operator belongs to all the ideals [1].

These semigroups do not have an exact analogue within the class of polynomials between Banach spaces. Nevertheless, in the present paper we introduce the class of Orlicz-Pettis polynomials, related to the unconditionally converging polynomials, and show that they share certain properties with the Orlicz-Pettis (linear) operators (see Section 2), and do not satisfy some others (Section 3). In order to obtain the results of Section 3, we are led to give a number of counterexamples, mainly of vector valued polynomials on c_0, which is the key space when we deal with weakly unconditionally Cauchy series. These counterexamples are of independent interest and can give new insight into the differences between linear operators and polynomials.

Throughout the paper, X, Y and Z denote Banach spaces, X^* is the dual of X, B_X is its closed unit ball, $\mathcal{L}(X, Y)$ stands for the space of operators from X into Y, $\mathcal{P}(^kX, Y)$ represents the space of all k-homogeneous (continuous) polynomials from X into Y, $\mathcal{L}(^kX, Y)$ is the space of all k-linear (continuous) mappings from X^k into Y. When the range space Y is omitted, it is supposed to be the scalar field (real or complex). We denote by $X\widehat{\otimes}_\pi Y$ the projective tensor product of X and Y; the

---

1991 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary: 46E15; Secondary: 46B20.

Key words and phrases. Polynomial on c_0, unconditionally converging polynomial, weakly unconditionally Cauchy series, unconditionally convergent series.

The first named author was supported in part by DGICYT Grant PB 97–0349 (Spain).

The second named author was supported in part by DGICYT Grant PB 96–0607 (Spain).

file oppbs.tex.

product of k spaces is represented by $\widehat{\otimes}_{\pi}^{k} X := X \widehat{\otimes}_{\pi} \cdots \widehat{\otimes}_{\pi} X$. We use the notation $x^{(k)} := x \otimes \overset{(k)}{\ldots} \otimes x$, where $x \in X$. The set of natural numbers is denoted by $\mathbb{N}$, and (e_n) is the unit vector basis of the space c_0. The coordinates of a vector $x \in c_0$ are denoted by $x(i)$ $(i = 1, 2, \ldots)$.

A formal series $\sum x_n$ in X is *weakly unconditionally Cauchy* (*w.u.C.,* for short) if, for every $\phi \in X^*$, we have $\sum |\phi(x_n)| < +\infty$. Equivalent definitions may be seen in [2, Theorem V.6]. The series is *unconditionally convergent* (*u.c.,* for short) if every subseries converges. Equivalent definitions may be seen in [3, Theorem 1.9].

It may be helpful to recall that every polynomial between Banach spaces takes w.u.C. (resp. u.c.) series into w.u.C. (resp. u.c.) series [7, Theorem 2]. The following simple fact will also be useful:

Proposition 1.1. *Given a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}(^k X, Y)$ and a w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X, the sequence $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ is weak Cauchy.*

Proof. Let $j \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, X)$ be the operator given by $j(e_n) = x_n$. Then $P \circ j \in \mathcal{P}(^k c_0, Y)$. Since c_0 has the Dunford-Pettis property, $P \circ j$ takes weak Cauchy sequences into weak Cauchy sequences [15]. So, the sequence

$$\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i\right)\right)_n = \left(P \circ j\left(\sum_{i=1}^{n} e_i\right)\right)_n$$

is weak Cauchy. □

A polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}(^k X, Y)$ $(k \geq 1)$ is *unconditionally converging* [5, 6] if, for each w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X, the sequence $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ is convergent in Y. The space of all unconditionally converging polynomials is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}(^k X, Y)$ (or $\mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{uc}}(X, Y)$ if $k = 1$). This class of polynomials has been very useful for obtaining polynomial characterizations of Banach space properties (see [12]). Easily, $T \in \mathcal{L}_{\mathrm{uc}}(X, Y)$ if and only if for each w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X, the series $\sum T(x_n)$ is u.c. in Y. The polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}(^k X, Y)$ is *(weakly) compact* if $P(B_X)$ is relatively (weakly) compact in Y. The space of compact polynomials from X into Y is denoted by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{co}}(^k X, Y)$. Every weakly compact polynomial is unconditionally converging, and every unconditionally converging polynomial on c_0 is compact (see [5] or [12]).

The standard notations and definitions in Banach space theory may be seen in [2]. For the basics in the theory of polynomials, we refer to [4, 14].

2. Positive results

In this Section, we introduce the Orlicz-Pettis polynomials, as those satisfying the following main result. We give some other properties, and a first example of a polynomial in this class.

Theorem 2.1. *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $P \in \mathcal{P}(^k X, Y)$, the following assertions are equivalent:*

(A) *Given a w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X, if the set $\left\{P\left(\sum_{i=1}^\infty a_n(i) x_i\right)\right\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}}$ is relatively weakly compact for every bounded sequence $(a_n) \subset c_0$, then $\sum x_n$ is u.c.*

(B) *Given a w.u.C. series* $\sum x_n$ *in* X*, if the set* $\{P(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_n(i)x_i)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is relatively compact for every bounded sequence* $(a_n)\subset c_0$*, then* $\sum x_n$ *is u.c.*

(C) *If the sequence* $(x_n)\subset X$ *is equivalent to the* c_0*-basis, then there is a bounded sequence* $(a_n)\subset c_0$ *such that the set* $\{P(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_n(i)x_i)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is not relatively weakly compact.*

(D) *If the sequence* $(x_n)\subset X$ *is equivalent to the* c_0*-basis, then there is a bounded sequence* $(a_n)\subset c_0$ *such that the set* $\{P(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_n(i)x_i)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ *is not relatively compact.*

(E) *For every operator* $T\in\mathcal{L}(Z,X)$*, if* $P\circ T\in\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kZ,Y)$*, then* T *is unconditionally converging.*

(F) *For every operator* $T\in\mathcal{L}(c_0,X)$*, if* $P\circ T\in\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{co}}({}^kc_0,Y)$*, then* T *is compact.*

(G) *For every subspace* $M\subseteq X$ *containing a copy of* c_0*, the polynomial* $P\circ j_M$ *is not unconditionally converging, where* j_M *denotes the embedding of* M *into* X*.*

(H) *For every subspace* $M\subseteq X$ *isomorphic to* c_0*, the polynomial* $P\circ j_M$ *is not compact, where* j_M *denotes the embedding of* M *into* X*.*

Proof. (A) ⇒ (B) and (C) ⇒ (D) are obvious.

(A) ⇒ (C): If (x_n) is equivalent to the c_0-basis, then the series $\sum x_n$ is w.u.C., not u.c. So it is enough to apply (A).

(B) ⇒ (D): By the same argument.

(D) ⇒ (E): Assume $T\in\mathcal{L}(Z,X)$ is not unconditionally converging. Then we can find a sequence $(z_n)\subset Z$ such that (z_n) and $(T(z_n))$ are equivalent to the c_0-basis. By (D), there is a bounded sequence $(a_n)\subset c_0$ such that the set $\{P\circ T(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_n(i)z_i)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is not relatively compact. Hence, letting M be the closed linear span of $\{z_n\}$, there is a bounded sequence $(x_n)\subset M$ such that $\{P\circ T(x_n)\}$ is not relatively compact. Therefore, $P\circ T\circ j_M$ is not compact. Since M is isomorphic to c_0, this implies that $P\circ T\circ j_M$ is not unconditionally converging, and we conclude that $P\circ T$ is not unconditionally converging.

(E) ⇒ (F): Take a noncompact operator $T\in\mathcal{L}(c_0,X)$. Then T is not unconditionally converging. By (E), $P\circ T$ is not unconditionally converging.

(F) ⇒ (G): Suppose there is a subspace $M\subseteq X$ containing c_0 such that $P\circ j_M$ is unconditionally converging. Then, there is a subspace $N\subseteq M$ isomorphic to c_0 so that $P\circ j_N$ is unconditionally converging and so compact. However, j_N is not compact.

(G) ⇒ (H): This is clear, since every unconditionally converging polynomial on c_0 is compact.

(H) ⇒ (A): Assume there is a w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X, not u.c., such that the set $\{P(\sum_{i=1}^{\infty} a_n(i)x_i)\}_{n\in\mathbb{N}}$ is relatively weakly compact for every bounded sequence $(a_n)\subset c_0$. Taking blocks, we can assume that (x_n) is equivalent to the c_0-basis. Let M be the closed linear span of $\{x_n\}$. Then, $P\circ j_M$ takes bounded sequences into relatively weakly compact sequences, and so $P\circ j_M$ is compact. □

Definition 2.2. We say that $P\in\mathcal{P}({}^kX,Y)$ is an *Orlicz-Pettis polynomial* if it satisfies the equivalent assertions of Theorem 2.1. We denote by $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc+}}({}^kX,Y)$ the space of all k-homogeneous Orlicz-Pettis polynomials from X into Y.

The choice of the name is due to the relationship with the u.c. series, which were studied by Orlicz and Pettis [2, Chapter IV].

The classes $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$ may be described by means of a family of sets. We say that a subset $A \subset X$ is a *WUC-set* if there is an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, X)$ such that $A = T(B_{c_0})$. We need a previous lemma.

Lemma 2.3. *Given a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}({}^kX, Y)$ which is not unconditionally converging, there is an embedding $j : c_0 \to X$ such that $P \circ j \notin \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kc_0, Y)$.*

Proof. If $P \notin \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$, we can find a w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X such that the sequence $(P(x_1 + \cdots + x_n))_n$ is not convergent. Let $j : c_0 \to X$ be given by $j(e_n) = x_n$. Then the sequence

$$(P \circ j(e_1 + \cdots + e_n))_n = (P(x_1 + \cdots + x_n))_n$$

is not convergent, so $P \circ j \notin \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kc_0, Y)$. □

The next Proposition highlights the opposition between the classes $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$.

Proposition 2.4. *For a polynomial $P \in \mathcal{P}({}^kX, Y)$, we have:*

(a) *$P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$ if and only if P takes WUC-sets into relatively (weakly) compact sets;*

(b) *$P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$ if and only if, for every WUC-set $A \subset X$, if $P(A)$ is relatively (weakly) compact, then so is A.*

Proof. (a) Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$ and $A = T(B_{c_0})$. Then $P \circ T \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kc_0, Y)$, and so $P(A) = P \circ T(B_{c_0})$ is relatively compact. Conversely, suppose $P \notin \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$. By the Lemma, there is $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, X)$ such that $P \circ T \notin \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}}({}^kc_0, Y)$. Therefore, $T(B_{c_0})$ is a WUC-set so that $P \circ T(B_{c_0})$ is not relatively weakly compact.

(b) Let $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$ and choose a WUC-set $A \subset X$ so that $P(A)$ is relatively weakly compact. Take $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, X)$ with $A = T(B_{c_0})$. Then $P \circ T(B_{c_0})$ is relatively weakly compact, so $P \circ T$ is compact. Since $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$, T is compact and A is relatively compact. Conversely, let $T \in \mathcal{L}(c_0, X)$ with $P \circ T$ compact. Since $P \circ T(B_{c_0})$ is relatively compact, we have that $T(B_{c_0})$ is relatively compact, so T is compact. Therefore, $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathrm{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$. □

The following result gives a polynomial satisfying the assertions of Theorem 2.1. Other examples are shown in Section 3.

Proposition 2.5. *For every Banach space X, the polynomial $\gamma_k : X \to \widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k X$ given by*

$$\gamma_k(x) = x^{(k)}$$

is an Orlicz-Pettis polynomial.

Proof. Take a subspace $M \subseteq X$ isomorphic to c_0, and let $j : c_0 \to M$ be a surjective isomorphism. From

$$\|\gamma_k \circ j_M \circ j(e_n)\| = \|j_M \circ j(e_n)\|^k \not\longrightarrow 0,$$

we get that $\gamma_k \circ j_M$ is not compact. Then apply (H) of Theorem 2.1. □

3. Counterexamples

In this Section, we first give some more properties of the polynomial γ_k considered in Proposition 2.5, some of which are used to establish a theorem about polynomials on spaces containing c_0. All these previous results are applied in the main theorem of the Section that provides sufficient conditions for a polynomial to be Orlicz-Pettis. A number of counterexamples are given to show that these conditions are not necessary.

Our first theorem gives a property of polynomials on spaces containing a copy of c_0. We need two previous results.

Lemma 3.1. *Given $k \in \mathbb{N}$, the sequence $\left(e_n^{(k)}\right)_n$ in $\widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k c_0$ is equivalent to the unit vector basis in c_0.*

Proof. By induction on k, we show that

$$\left\| a_1 e_1^{(k)} + \cdots + a_n e_n^{(k)} \right\| = \| a_1 e_1 + \cdots + a_n e_n \|$$

where $(a_i)_{i=1}^n$ is a finite sequence of scalars.

For $k = 1$ there is nothing to prove. Suppose the result holds for $k-1$, and let $r_n(t) = \operatorname{sign} \sin 2^n \pi t$ for $t \in [0,1]$. Then, assuming $\max |a_i| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} a_1 e_1^{(k)} + \cdots + a_n e_n^{(k)} &= \\ &= \int_0^1 \left[a_1 r_1(t) e_1^{(k-1)} + \cdots + a_n r_n(t) e_n^{(k-1)} \right] \otimes \left[a_1 r_1(t) e_1 + \cdots + a_n r_n(t) e_n \right] dt \\ &= 2^{-n} \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \left[a_1 \epsilon_1(i) e_1^{(k-1)} + \cdots + a_n \epsilon_n(i) e_n^{(k-1)} \right] \otimes \left[a_1 \epsilon_1(i) e_1 + \cdots + a_n \epsilon_n(i) e_n \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $\epsilon_j(i)$ is the value of $r_j(t)$ on the interval

$$\left(\frac{i-1}{2^n}, \frac{i}{2^n} \right) \qquad \text{for } 1 \le i \le 2^n.$$

By the induction hypothesis, we get

$$\left\| a_1 e_1^{(k)} + \cdots + a_n e_n^{(k)} \right\| \le 1.$$

On the other hand, there is $i_0 \in \{1, \ldots, k\}$ so that

$$\| a_1 e_1 + \cdots + a_n e_n \| = |a_{i_0}|.$$

Considering e_{i_0} as a vector of ℓ_1, take

$$e_{i_0}^{(k)} \in \left(\widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k c_0 \right)^* \approx \mathcal{L}({}^k c_0).$$

Clearly,

$$\left\| e_{i_0}^{(k)} \right\| = 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \left\langle e_{i_0}^{(k)}, a_1 e_1^{(k)} + \cdots + a_n e_n^{(k)} \right\rangle = a_{i_0},$$

so the result follows. □

Proposition 3.2. *There is a w.u.C. series* $\sum y_i$ *in* c_0*, not u.c., such that* $\sum_i \gamma_k(y_i)$ *is u.c. in* $\widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k c_0$ *for each* $k \geq 2$*.*

Proof. For simplicity, consider the case $k = 2$. Take the vectors

$$y_i = \frac{e_n}{n} \quad \text{for} \quad n \in \mathbb{N}\ , \quad \frac{n(n-1)}{2} < i \leq \frac{n(n+1)}{2}\ .$$

Clearly, the series $\sum y_i$ is w.u.C. Since

$$\left\| \sum_{i=1+n(n+1)/2}^{m(m+1)/2} y_i \right\| = 1 \quad \text{for} \quad m > n,$$

the series is not u.c. Moreover, for every finite sequence

$$\frac{n(n+1)}{2} < i_1 < \cdots < i_l,$$

we have, from Lemma 3.1,

$$\left\| \sum_{j=1}^{l} y_{i_j} \otimes y_{i_j} \right\| < \frac{1}{n}\ .$$

Therefore, $\sum y_i \otimes y_i$ is u.c. in $c_0 \widehat{\otimes}_\pi c_0$. □

Theorem 3.3. *Given Banach spaces* X *and* Y*, with* X *containing a copy of* c_0*, an integer* $k > 1$ *and a polynomial* $P \in \mathcal{P}(^kX, Y)$*, we can find a w.u.C. series* $\sum x_i$ *in* X*, not u.c., such that* $\sum P(x_i)$ *is u.c. in* Y*.*

Proof. Let $j : c_0 \to X$ be an embedding. Consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} X \arrow[r, "\gamma_k"] & \widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k X \\ c_0 \arrow[u, "j"] \arrow[r, "\gamma_k"'] & \widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k c_0 \arrow[u, "\otimes^k j"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

Let $\sum y_i$ be the series constructed in the proof of Proposition 3.2. Then, the series $\sum j(y_i)$ is w.u.C., not u.c., in X, and the series $\sum_i \gamma_k \circ j(y_i) = \sum_i \left(\otimes^k j\right) \circ \gamma_k(y_i)$ is u.c. Let $\tilde{P} : \widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k X \to Y$ be the operator defined by $\tilde{P}(x_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_k) := \hat{P}(x_1, \ldots, x_k)$, where $\hat{P} \in \mathcal{L}(^kX, Y)$ is the symmetric k-linear mapping associated to P. Then the series $\sum_i P \circ j(y_i) = \sum_i \tilde{P} \circ \gamma_k \circ j(y_i)$ is u.c. in Y. □

The next theorem shows that the polynomial $\gamma_k : X \to \widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k X$ takes sequences equivalent to the c_0-basis into sequences equivalent to the c_0-basis. Again, we need two preparatory results.

Lemma 3.4. *The polynomial* $\gamma_k : c_0 \to \widehat{\otimes}_\pi^k c_0$ *takes sequences equivalent to the* c_0*-basis into sequences equivalent to the* c_0*-basis.*

Proof. Letting $j : c_0 \to c_0$ be an isomorphism, consider the commutative diagram

$$\begin{tikzcd} c_0 \arrow[r, "\gamma_k"] & \widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi c_0 \\ c_0 \arrow[u, "j"] \arrow[r, "\gamma_k"'] & \widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi c_0 \arrow[u, "\otimes^k j"'] \end{tikzcd}$$

Since $(\gamma_k(e_n))_n$ is equivalent to the c_0-basis (Lemma 3.1), it is enough to show that $\otimes^k j$ is an injective isomorphism. Since $j(c_0)$ is complemented in c_0, there is an operator $S : c_0 \to c_0$ such that $S \circ j = I_{c_0}$. Then, $\left(\otimes^k S\right) \circ \left(\otimes^k j\right)$ is the identity map on $\widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi c_0$. Hence, $\otimes^k j$ is an injective isomorphism. □

Proposition 3.5. *Let $j : c_0 \to X$ be an injective isomorphism. Then the operator*

$$j^{(k)} : \widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi c_0 \longrightarrow \widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi X$$

is an injective isomorphism.

Proof. Take $z \in \widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi c_0$ with $z = \sum_{i=1}^\infty x_i^1 \otimes \cdots \otimes x_i^k$, and $A \in \left(\widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi c_0\right)^* \approx \mathcal{L}(^k c_0)$, with $\|A\| = 1$ and $\langle A, z\rangle = \|z\|$. There is an extension $\tilde{A} \in \mathcal{L}(^k \ell_\infty)$ of A with $\|\tilde{A}\| = \|A\|$ [12]. Consider the second adjoint $j^{**} : \ell_\infty \to X^{**}$ of j. By the injectivity of ℓ_∞, the operator $(j^{**})^{-1} : j^{**}(\ell_\infty) \to \ell_\infty$ has an extension to an operator $\pi : X^{**} \to \ell_\infty$; clearly, $\pi \circ j^{**} = I_{\ell_\infty}$. Let $B := \tilde{A} \circ (\pi \circ J_X)^k \in \mathcal{L}(^k X)$, where $J_X : X \to X^{**}$ is the canonical embedding. Then, $\|B\| \leq \|\tilde{A}\| \cdot \|\pi\|^k$ and

$$B \circ j^k = \tilde{A} \circ (\pi \circ J_X \circ j)^k = \tilde{A} \circ (\pi \circ j^{**} \circ J_{c_0})^k = \tilde{A} \circ J_{c_0}^k = A.$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|\pi\|^k \cdot \|A\| \cdot \|j^{(k)}(z)\| &\geq |\langle B, j^{(k)}(z)\rangle| \\ &= \left|\sum_{i=1}^\infty B\left(j\left(x_i^1\right), \ldots, j\left(x_i^k\right)\right)\right| \\ &= \left|\sum_{i=1}^\infty A\left(x_i^1, \ldots, x_i^k\right)\right| \\ &= |\langle A, z\rangle| \\ &= \|z\|, \end{aligned}$$

and this finishes the proof. □

Theorem 3.6. *The polynomial $\gamma_k : X \to \widehat{\otimes}^k_\pi X$ takes sequences equivalent to the c_0-basis into sequences equivalent to the c_0-basis.*

Proof. If X contains no copy of c_0, the result is trivially true. If $X = c_0$, see Lemma 3.4. If X contains a copy of c_0, the last Proposition reduces the problem to the case $X = c_0$. □

The following result gives an example of a polynomial on c_0 which will be useful.

Proposition 3.7. *There is a polynomial* $P \in \mathcal{P}(^2c_0, c_0)$ *such that* $P(e_n) = 0$ *for all* n*, but* P *is not compact on any infinite dimensional subspace.*

Proof. Consider a bijection

$$(\alpha, \beta) : \mathbb{N} \longrightarrow \{(n, m) \in \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} : n \neq m\}.$$

Define

$$P(x) := (x(\alpha(i))x(\beta(i)))_{i=1}^{\infty} \quad \text{for} \quad x = (x(i)) \in c_0.$$

Then $P(e_n) = 0$ for all n. If $M \subseteq c_0$ is an infinite dimensional subspace, we can find a norm one sequence $(x_n) \subset c_0$ disjointly supported such that $\operatorname{dist}(x_n, M) < 2^{-n}$. For each $n \in \mathbb{N}$, let $k_n \in \mathbb{N}$ satisfy $|x_n(k_n)| = 1$. Then

$$\|P(x_{2n} + x_{2n+1})\| \geq |x_{2n}(k_{2n})x_{2n+1}(k_{2n+1})| = 1,$$

which implies that P is not compact on M. □

We can now state the main result of the Section.

Theorem 3.8. *Let* $P \in \mathcal{P}(^kX, Y)$ *be a polynomial, with* $k \geq 2$*. Consider the following assertions:*

(A) *If* $\sum x_n$ *is w.u.C. in* X*, and* $\sum P(x_n)$ *is u.c. in* Y*, then* $\sum x_n$ *is u.c.*

(B) *Every sequence* $(x_n) \subset X$ *equivalent to the* c_0*-basis has a subsequence* (x_{n_i}) *such that* $(P(x_{n_i}))$ *is equivalent to the* c_0*-basis.*

(C) *If* $\sum x_n$ *is w.u.C. in* X*, and* $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ *is convergent, then* $\sum x_n$ *is u.c.*

(D) *If the sequence* $(x_n) \subset X$ *is equivalent to the* c_0*-basis, then* $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ *is not relatively compact.*

(E) *If the sequence* $(x_n) \subset X$ *is equivalent to the* c_0*-basis, then* $\lim \|P(x_n)\| \not\to 0$.

(F) P *is an Orlicz-Pettis polynomial.*

Then the following and only the following implications hold:

$$\begin{tikzcd}
(A) \arrow[r, Rightarrow] \arrow[d, Rightarrow] & (B) \arrow[r, Leftrightarrow] & (E) \arrow[d, Rightarrow] \\
(C) \arrow[r, Leftrightarrow] & (D) \arrow[r, Rightarrow] & (F)
\end{tikzcd}$$

Proof. (A) $\Rightarrow$ (B) and (A) $\Rightarrow$ (C): If P satisfies (A), then Theorem 3.3 implies that X contains no copy of c_0. So (B) and (C) are satisfied in a trivial way.

(B) $\Rightarrow$ (E) is obvious.

(E) $\Rightarrow$ (B): Let $(x_n) \subset X$ be equivalent to the c_0-basis. Then $\sum x_n$ is w.u.C., so $\sum P(x_n)$ is also w.u.C. [7]. In particular, $(P(x_n))$ is weakly null. By (E), passing to a subsequence, we can assume that $(P(x_n))$ is seminormalized and basic, so it is equivalent to the c_0-basis [2, Corollary V.7].

(B) $\not\Rightarrow$ (A): Consider the polynomial $\gamma_k : c_0 \to \widehat{\otimes}_{\pi}^{k} c_0$ (see Proposition 3.2 and Lemma 3.4).

(D) $\not\Rightarrow$ (A): Consider the polynomial defined in Proposition 3.7.

(C) $\Rightarrow$ (D): Assume P does not satisfy (D). Then there is a sequence $(x_n) \subset X$ equivalent to the c_0-basis, such that $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ is relatively compact. We can find an increasing sequence of indices (m_i) so that $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i\right)\right)_n$ is convergent, where

$$y_i = \sum_{j=m_i+1}^{m_{i+1}} x_j \,. \tag{1}$$

Since (y_i) is equivalent to the c_0-basis, P does not satisfy (C).

(D) $\Rightarrow$ (C): Assume P does not satisfy (C). Then there is a w.u.C. series $\sum x_n$ in X, not u.c., so that $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ is convergent. Take an increasing sequence of indices (m_i) so that (y_i) is equivalent to the c_0-basis, where y_i is defined as in (1). Then $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n y_i\right)\right)_n$ is a subsequence of $\left(P\left(\sum_{i=1}^n x_i\right)\right)_n$ and so it converges, in contradiction with (D).

(E) $\Rightarrow$ (F): Assume $T \in \mathcal{L}(Z,X)$ is not unconditionally converging. Then we can find a sequence $(z_n) \subset Z$ such that (z_n) and $(T(z_n))$ are equivalent to the c_0-basis. If P satisfies (E), we have $\|P \circ T(z_n)\| \not\to 0$, which implies that $P \circ T \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{uc}}({}^kZ, Y)$. So, by Theorem 2.1(E), $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$.

(F) $\not\Rightarrow$ (E): The polynomial P of Proposition 3.7 does not satisfy (E). To see that it does satisfy (F), take an operator $T \in \mathcal{L}(Z, c_0)$ not unconditionally converging. There is an operator $j : c_0 \to Z$ such that $(T \circ j(e_n))$ is equivalent to (e_n). Passing to a perturbed subsequence, we can assume that $(T \circ j(e_n))$ is disjointly supported. The series $\sum_n (j(e_{2n}) + j(e_{2n+1}))$ is w.u.C. However, $\|P \circ T\,(j(e_{2n}) + j(e_{2n+1}))\|$ is bounded away from 0, so $P \circ T$ is not unconditionally converging. By Theorem 2.1(E), $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{uc}+}({}^kZ, c_0)$.

(D) $\Rightarrow$ (F): Assume $T \in \mathcal{L}(Z,X)$ is not unconditionally converging. Then we can find a sequence $(z_n) \subset Z$ such that (z_n) and $(T(z_n))$ are equivalent to the c_0-basis. If P satisfies (D), the sequence $\left(P \circ T\left(\sum_{i=1}^n z_i\right)\right)_n$ is not relatively compact. Hence, $P \circ T \notin \mathcal{P}_{\text{uc}}({}^kX, Y)$. By Theorem 2.1(E), $P \in \mathcal{P}_{\text{uc}+}({}^kX, Y)$.

(D) $\not\Rightarrow$ (E): Let P be the polynomial defined in Proposition 3.7, and $(x_n) \subset c_0$ a sequence equivalent to the c_0-basis. Denote $y_n := x_1 + \cdots + x_n$, and $z := \sum_{n=1}^\infty x_n \in \ell_\infty \backslash c_0$. Let

$$3\delta := \limsup_i z(i) > 0.$$

If the lim sup were not positive, then we would take the lim inf. Choose $i_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ with $|z(i_1) - 3\delta| < \delta$. There is $n_1 \in \mathbb{N}$ so that $|y_n(i_1) - 3\delta| < \delta$ for all $n \geq n_1$. Choose now $i_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ $(i_2 > i_1)$ so that $|y_{n_1}(i)| < \delta/2$ for all $i \geq i_2$ and $|z(i_2) - 3\delta| < \delta$. There is $n_2 \in \mathbb{N}$ $(n_2 > n_1)$ so that $|y_n(i_2) - 3\delta| < \delta$ for all $n \geq n_2$.

Proceeding in this way, we obtain two increasing sequences of integers (i_j), (n_j) so that, for $j < l$,

$$\begin{aligned}
\left\|P\left(y_{n_j}\right) - P\left(y_{n_l}\right)\right\| &\geq \left|y_{n_j}(i_1)y_{n_j}(i_l) - y_{n_l}(i_1)y_{n_l}(i_l)\right| \\
&\geq |y_{n_l}(i_1)| \cdot |y_{n_l}(i_l)| - \left|y_{n_j}(i_1)\right| \cdot \left|y_{n_j}(i_l)\right| \\
&> 2\delta^2.
\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, P satisfies (D). Clearly, P does not satisfy (E).

(E) $\not\Rightarrow$ (D): Let $P \in \mathcal{P}({}^2c_0, c_0)$ be given by

$$P(x) = \sum_{j=2}^{\infty} \sum_{i=1}^{j-1} (x(j) - x(i))\, x(j) e_{j^2+i} \qquad \text{for } x = (x(i))_{i=1}^{\infty} \in c_0.$$

Clearly, P satisfies (E). Since $P(e_1 + \cdots + e_n) = 0$ for all n, P does not satisfy (D). □

Remark 3.9. In the linear case ($k = 1$), all the assertions of Theorem 3.8 are equivalent [8]. So, our choice for the definition of the Orlicz-Pettis polynomials provides the widest possible class.

References

[1] P. Aiena, M. González and A. Martínez-Abejón, Operator semigroups in Banach space theory. Preprint.

[2] J. Diestel, *Sequences and Series in Banach Spaces,* Graduate Texts in Math. **92**, Springer, Berlin 1984.

[3] J. Diestel, H. Jarchow and A. Tonge, *Absolutely Summing Operators,* Cambridge Stud. Adv. Math. **43**, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge 1995.

[4] S. Dineen, *Complex Analysis in Locally Convex Spaces,* Math. Studies **57**, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1981.

[5] M. Fernández-Unzueta, A new approach to unconditionality for polynomials on Banach spaces. Preprint.

[6] M. Fernández-Unzueta, Unconditionally convergent polynomials in Banach spaces and related properties, *Extracta Math.* **12** (1997), 305–307.

[7] M. González and J. M. Gutiérrez, Unconditionally converging polynomials on Banach spaces, *Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc.* **117** (1995), 321–331.

[8] M. González and A. Martínez-Abejón, Lifting unconditionally converging series and semigroups of operators, *Bull. Austral. Math. Soc.* **57** (1998), 135–145.

[9] M. González and V. M. Onieva, Semi-Fredholm operators and semigroups associated with some classical operator ideals, *Proc. R. Irish Acad.* **88**A (1988), 35–38.

[10] M. González and V. M. Onieva, Semi-Fredholm operators and semigroups associated with some classical operator ideals—II, *Proc. R. Irish Acad.* **88**A (1988), 119–124.

[11] M. González and V. M. Onieva, Characterizations of tauberian operators and other semigroups of operators, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **108** (1990), 399–405.

[12] J. M. Gutiérrez and I. Villanueva, Extensions of multilinear operators and Banach space properties. Preprint.

[13] N. Kalton and A. Wilansky, Tauberian operators on Banach spaces, *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.* **57** (1976), 251–255.

[14] J. Mujica, *Complex Analysis in Banach Spaces,* Math. Studies **120**, North-Holland, Amsterdam 1986.

[15] R. A. Ryan, Dunford-Pettis properties, *Bull. Acad. Polon. Sci. Sér. Sci. Math.* **27** (1979), 373–379.

Departamento de Matemáticas, Facultad de Ciencias, Universidad de Cantabria, 39071 Santander (Spain)
E-mail address: `gonzalem@ccaix3.unican.es`

Departamento de Matemática Aplicada, ETS de Ingenieros Industriales, Universidad Politécnica de Madrid, C. José Gutiérrez Abascal 2, 28006 Madrid (Spain)
E-mail address: `jgutierrez@etsii.upm.es`